

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-19 are presently active in this case, Claims 2 and 13 canceled and Claims 1, 3-4, 12 and 14-15 amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 5-12 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2003/0188972 to Shatrov; Claims 2-3 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shatrov in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0150419 to Daragheh; and Claims 4 and 15 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

First, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Yevsikov for the January 18, 2007 personal interview at which time the outstanding issues in this case were discussed. During the interview, Applicants presented amendments and arguments substantially as indicated in this Response. While no formal agreement was reached, Examiner Yevsikov indicated that the arguments and amendments presented appeared to overcome the outstanding rejection, but further search is required.

In addition, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Yevsikov for the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 4 and 15. In order to expedite issuance of a patent in this case, Applicants have amended Claims 4 and 15 to be in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, as discussed in the January 18<sup>th</sup> personal interview, Claims 4 and 15 do not include reference to a Keronite layer since this term is used as a trademark. Rather, Claims 4 and 15 refer to the plasma electrolytic oxidation process that forms the Keronite layer. Further, Claims 2 and 13, which

recite Keronite, have been canceled. Thus, Applicants' Claims 4 and 15 are in condition for allowance.

Turning now to the merits, in order to expedite issuance of a patent in this case, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 12 to clarify the patentable features of the present invention over the cited references. Specifically, Claims 1 and 12 each recite a bonding layer coupled to a processing element, and a protective layer coupled to the bonding layer, the protective layer being a spray coating. Support for this limitation is provided at least by paragraph [0028] of Applicants' specification as originally filed. Therefore the amendments to Claims 1 and 12 do not raise an issue of new matter.

In contrast to amended Claims 1 and 12, the cited reference to Shatrov et al. discloses a process of forming ceramic coatings on metals and alloys by a plasma electrolytic oxide (PEO) process. As discussed in the January 18<sup>th</sup> interview, Shatrov et al. discloses dispersing ceramic powders within the electrolyte of the PEO process and generating acoustic vibrations in the electrolyte such that the disbursed powder can contribute to the PEO layer growth on the metal treated in the electrolyte process. Thus, Shatrov et al. discloses a PEO process for forming an improved PEO layer on a metal, which corresponds to the bonding layer of Applicants' Claims 1 and 12. However, Shatrov et al. does not disclose additionally providing a spray coating protective layer on the PEO layer as now required by Applicants' Claims 1 and 12.

The secondary reference to Daragheh et al. does not correct the deficiencies of Shatrov et al. As discussed in the January 18<sup>th</sup> interview, Daragheh et al. discloses providing a plasma electrolytic oxidation layer on a piston ring groove. This layer is provided using a conventional PEO process and masking portions of the piston that will not be coated. Thus, the PEO layer corresponds to the claimed bonding layer. However, as with Shatrov et al.

discussed above, Daragheh et al. does not disclose providing a further protective layer on the PEO layer. Thus, Applicants' Claims 1 and 12 also define over Daragheh et al.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants' independent Claims 1 and 12 patentably define over the cited references as discussed above. Further as Claims 3-11 and 14-19 depend from Claims 1 and 12, respectively, these claims also patentably define over the cited references.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouch  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 32,829

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)  
EDG/rac

Edwin D. Garlepp  
Registration No. 45,330